

**REMARKS**

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of October 11, 2005.

Claims 1 through 23 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 8, 11, 13 through 17, and 20 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments may be found in paragraphs [0010] and [0025] of the specification. No new matter has been entered to the disclosure as the amendment clearly complies with 35 U.S.C. § 132. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Anticipation Rejections**

**Anticipation Rejection Based on Docter *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,330,610)**

Claims 1 through 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Docter *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,330,610) (hereinafter “Docter”).

Applicant asserts that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claim 1 recites a printing system, comprising . . . a printer including . . . a processor, and a printing component in communication with the processor, and a filtering program associated with the processor so as to control printing of a file by the printing component based on at least one of a presence or absence of at least one prespecified characteristic from a packet including said file.

Applicant asserts that Docter does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of claim 1 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant asserts that Docter does not describe the element of the claimed invention calling for “a filtering program associated with said processor so as to control printing of a file.” Docter describes that “[t]he present invention is related to a system capable of filtering data for a particular user (also referred to as a data recipient) without compromising that user’s privacy.” Col. 3, lines 1-3. The data of Docter “may be in the form of advertisements” and “news articles” or “related to a subject that is of no interest to the recipient or related to a type of product that the recipient does not use

use and does not intend to purchase.” Col. 1, lines 15-23. Regarding a printer, Docter describes “[a] printer 146 is coupled to bus 130 and is capable of creating a hard-copy of information generated by or used by the computer.” Col. 10, lines 7-10. That is not a filtering program able to control the printing of a file. Therefore, for at least this reason, Docter does not anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and independent claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 through 10 are allowable for at least the reason of depending either directly or indirectly from allowable independent claim 1.

Claim 2 is additionally allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a filtering program stored by at least one of a memory device and firmware of a printer associated with a processor.

Claim 6 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a filtering program that causes a processor to prevent a printing component from printing a file of a packet having at least one undesirable characteristic.

Claim 7 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a filtering program that instructs a processor to cause a printing component to print a file of a packet having a desirable characteristic.

Claim 8 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a filtering program that instructs a processor to cause a printing component to print a file only if a packet lacks an undesirable characteristic and has a desirable characteristic.

Claim 9 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently an undesirable characteristic comprising one of a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, and at least one prespecified command.

Claim 10 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a desirable characteristic comprising one of a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file type, and a password.

Regarding presently amended claims 11 and 20 and dependents, after carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner’s comments, Applicant has amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Presently amended independent claim 11 recites a device-specific filtering method, comprising . . . transmitting a printing packet comprising at least one file from a source

computer, across a network, to a device of the network, evaluating at least one prespecified characteristic of the printing packet following passage of the printing packet through a server of the network, and controlling at least one of further transmission of the printing packet to the device and processing of the at least one file of the printing packet by the device based on the evaluating.

Applicant asserts that Docter does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended claim 11 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant asserts that Docter does not describe the element of the claimed invention calling for “a printing packet.” Docter describes that “[t]he present invention is related to a system capable of filtering data for a particular user (also referred to as a data recipient) without compromising that user’s privacy.” Col. 3, lines 1-3. The data of Docter “may be in the form of advertisements” and “news articles” or “related to a subject that is of no interest to the recipient or related to a type of product that the recipient does not use and does not intend to purchase.” Col. 1, lines 15-23. The data filtered by Docter is not a printing packet. Therefore, for at least this reason, Docter does not anticipate presently amended claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and presently amended independent claim 11 is allowable.

Claims 11 through 19 are allowable for at least the reason of depending either directly or indirectly from allowable independent claim 11.

Claim 13 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently preventing an at least one of further transmission of a printing packet to a device and processing of an at least one file of the printing packet by the device if the printing packet has an undesirable characteristic.

Claim 14 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently permitting an at least one of further transmission of a printing packet to a device and processing of an at least one file of the printing packet by the device if the printing packet has a desirable characteristic.

Claim 15 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently permitting an at least one of further transmission of a printing packet to a device and processing of an at least one file of the printing packet by the device if the printing packet lacks at least one undesirable characteristic and has at least one desirable characteristic.

Claim 16 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently an undesirable characteristic comprising one of a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, and at least one prespecified command.

Claim 17 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a desirable characteristic comprising one of a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file type, and a password.

Presently amended independent claim 20 recites a system for filtering a file transmitted to a destination device, comprising . . . a processor in communication with a network across which the file has been transmitted, and a filtering program associated with the processor so as to control at least one of transmission of a packet including at least one file to be printed to the destination device and processing of the at least one file to be printed by the destination device based on at least one of a presence or absence of at least one prespecified characteristic from the packet including the at least one file to be printed.

Applicant asserts that Docter does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended claim 20 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant asserts that Docter does not describe the element of the claimed invention calling for “a packet including at least one file to be printed.” Docter describes that “[t]he present invention is related to a system capable of filtering data for a particular user (also referred to as a data recipient) without compromising that user’s privacy.” Col. 3, lines 1-3. The data of Docter “may be in the form of advertisements” and “news articles” or “related to a subject that is of no interest to the recipient or related to a type of product that the recipient does not use and does not intend to purchase.” Col. 1, lines 15-23. The data filtered by Docter is not a packet including a file to be printed. Therefore, for at least this reason, Docter does not anticipate presently amended claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and presently amended independent claim 20 is allowable.

Claims 21 through 23 are allowable for at least the reason of depending either directly or indirectly from allowable independent claim 20.

Applicant submits that claims 1 through 23 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Serial No. 10/086,746

Applicant requests the allowance of claims 1 through 23 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan  
Registration No. 28,393  
Attorney for Applicant  
TRASKBRITT, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: December 22, 2005  
JRD/dlm:lmh

Document in ProLaw